

MO Part C

FFY2014 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Executive Summary:

The U. S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), requires that every state receiving funding from the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C develop a State Performance Plan (SPP) to evaluate its efforts in implementing the requirements and purposes of IDEA. The State is required to report on its efforts every year in an Annual Performance Report (APR). More information on the State's General Supervision, Technical Assistance, Professional Development, Stakeholder Involvement and Reporting to the Public follows this Executive Summary.

The State must report on 11 SPP/APR indicators established by OSEP. Each of the first ten indicators includes baseline data, and measurable and rigorous targets. Targets for compliance indicators are set by OSEP at 100%, while targets for results indicators are set by the State.

Indicator 11, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), is a five year plan designed to improve the quality of early intervention services provided to children and families participating in the early intervention program. The SSIP consists of three phases: Phase I – Analysis; Phase II – Plan; and Phase 3 – Implementation and Evaluation. In Phase I submitted March 27, 2015, the state conducted a comprehensive analysis of First Steps data and infrastructure. Stakeholders helped the state identify the following measureable result for the SSIP: to improve social and emotional outcomes for children enrolled in First Steps by the time they exit the program. To help the state meet its improvement goals, stakeholders also helped select levels of improvement activities.

This SPP/APR covers Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2014, reporting on data from State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2015 (July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015). SPP/APR Part C Indicators 1-10 must be submitted electronically via OSEP's GRADS 360 system by February 1, 2016 and Phase II of the SSIP (Indicator 11) by April 1, 2016.

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

Missouri Part C Infrastructure

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department) is the lead State agency responsible for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Missouri's early intervention system, known as First Steps, is comprised of: (A) regional System Point of Entry offices; (B) a Central Finance Office; and (C) independent early intervention providers.

A. Regional System Point of Entry Offices: The State is divided into ten early intervention regions. The State of Missouri contracts with a single entity (System Point of Entry or SPOE) in each of the ten regions. The SPOEs are responsible for the local administration of the program, including referral, intake, eligibility determination and Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) development. All service coordination activities are provided by the SPOE.

B. Central Finance Office: The State of Missouri also contracts with a CFO whose responsibilities include: enrolling and paying providers; fiscal management; and conducting regular reviews of provider accounts to ensure providers continue to meet the criteria as qualified personnel, including completion of module training, a review of provider licensure, liability insurance and criminal history checks.

The CFO also maintains the child data and IFSP system known as WebSPOE. The WebSPOE system contains all elements of referral, evaluation, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and implementation. Data are entered in real-time and

are accessible based on a user-level access in order to maintain privacy. The CFO provides a support help desk to trouble-shoot problems with users, which helps the Department ensure accurate data are entered in the system.

C. Independent Early Intervention Providers: All early intervention services are delivered by providers who meet the Department's qualifications. SPOEs organize and coordinate providers into Early Intervention Teams (EIT). EIT is Missouri's service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. Each team includes, at a minimum, an Occupational Therapist, Physical Therapist, Speech/Language Pathologist, Special Instructor and Service Coordinator.

Lead Agency Staff

The Department's Office of Special Education employs staff in the Early Intervention section who are responsible for implementing and monitoring the Part C program. The early intervention section consists of: (A) Part C Coordinator; (B) regional Area Directors; and, (C) compliance staff.

A. Part C Coordinator: The Part C Coordinator oversees the implementation of the regulations and contractual obligations of the SPOEs and CFO, and coordinates with multiple State agencies including other sections at the Department. The Coordinator is also responsible for the supervision of the regional Area Directors and compliance staff.

B. Regional Area Directors: There are five Area Directors located in State offices throughout the SPOE regions. Each Area Director provides guidance and technical assistance in the areas of child find, public awareness, SPOE operations, compliance requirements and best practice to two SPOE offices. The Area Directors also conduct annual provider trainings and monthly monitoring of provider billing practices.

C. Compliance Staff: There are two Compliance staff that conduct annual compliance monitoring, document any findings of noncompliance and verify timely correction of all identified noncompliance. This staff is also responsible for investigating child complaints related to the Part C program.

WebSPOE Data System

The Department operates a secure, web-based child data system called WebSPOE. The system contains all elements of a child's record, including referral, evaluation, eligibility and IFSP information. The system is compliance driven and ensures compliance with regulations as well as best practice. SPOEs utilize the system to record child and family demographic information and enter authorizations for providers to deliver early intervention services. Providers utilize the system to record progress notes, submit claims for delivered early intervention services and review payment history.

Given the extent of data available in WebSPOE, the system has become an integral part of Missouri's general supervision system. Staff in the Department's Early Intervention section utilize the system to conduct compliance monitoring and service monitoring activities.

Compliance Monitoring Procedures

The ten SPOEs are monitored each year for compliance with SPP/APR indicators. The monitoring data reported in this SPP/APR were obtained through desk reviews of individual child records in accordance with the state's compliance monitoring procedures. The desk reviews included information from both hard copy records and data in WebSPOE. At least one randomly selected record was reviewed from all Service Coordinators with a minimum of six months of First Steps experience.

During the 2014-15 monitoring, if the SPOE had 80% to 99% compliance on an indicator, the SPOE had an opportunity to correct the instance prior to a finding being issued. Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs had to be corrected: (1) the child level, with each individual case of noncompliance corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) the SPOE level, with the SPOE providing documentation from new files, demonstrating compliance with the indicator. If the SPOE was able to demonstrate correction of both prongs prior to a finding being issued, then no finding was issued and no corrective action was required.

However, if the SPOE had 79% or less compliance on an indicator, then a finding was issued and a corrective action was required for that indicator. The SPOE did not have the opportunity to correct these instances prior to a finding being issued.

For all findings issued, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs of correction must be verified by Compliance staff in order to declare the SPOE 100% in compliance on the indicator: (1) at the child level, documentation that indicates the individual noncompliance has been corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) at the SPOE level, documentation from new files, completed after the SPOE's corrective action plan was implemented, that

indicates the SPOE is correctly implementing the regulations. All noncompliance, both at the individual child level and at the SPOE level, must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months from the date the SPOE agency is notified of noncompliance.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Area Directors and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages.

Service Monitoring Procedures

All early intervention services delivered in the Part C program are subject to federal, State and local monitoring. As part of the provider agreement to deliver early intervention services and as part of the SPOE contract requirements, providers and SPOEs must participate in routine monitoring of the services delivered to families in early intervention. Providers are required to meet and maintain all standards, guidelines and policies for early intervention, including proper billing practices. The Department conducts regular monitoring in order to verify providers are documenting and claiming services in accordance with the Department's guidelines and instructions.

Examples of service monitoring procedures include a monthly review of the number of hours a day that providers billed for early intervention services, a quarterly review of missed visits and investigation of complaints about provider billing practices. For each activity, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section review claims and progress notes to verify there is sufficient documentation to substantiate payments to providers. Additional documentation to support the provider payment may be requested from the provider. Staff may provide technical assistance or training to a provider regarding recordkeeping and billing practices.

Dispute Resolution System

The Missouri Part C complaint system includes three options to resolve disputes: (A) child complaint; (B) due process hearing; and, (C) mediation.

A. Child Complaint: A child complaint may be filed by any person or organization who believes there has been a violation of any State or federal regulation implementing Part C of the IDEA. The complaint must be filed in writing with the Department, Office of Special Education, unless it is determined the requirement to file in writing effectively denies the individual the right to file the complaint.

Child complaints are investigated by Compliance staff in the Early Intervention section. Decisions are issued within 60 calendar days of the receipt of the complaint, unless it is determined a longer period is necessary due to exceptional circumstances that exist with respect to a particular complaint, in which case an extension is made. If the Department, SPOE or provider is found out of compliance, the Department addresses in its decision how to remediate the noncompliance. If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing or contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that hearing, the parts of the complaint being addressed in the due process hearing are set aside until the conclusion of the hearing. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to individual child complaints and track timelines for resolution of child complaints.

B. Due Process Hearing: Requests for a due process hearing must be made in writing to the Department, Office of Special Education. A Hearing Officer is assigned to conduct the hearing and issue a written decision. A decision is issued within 30 days of the receipt of the request unless the timelines have been extended by the parties.

If the Department or the parent disagrees with the Hearing Officer's final decision, either party has a right to appeal the decision to a State or federal district court. The decision of the Hearing Officer is a final decision unless a party to the hearing appeals. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to due process requests and track timelines for due process hearing requests.

C. Mediation: Requests to settle disagreements through mediation may be made at any time, including prior to initiating a child complaint or due process hearing or after a child complaint or due process hearing has been requested. Both parties must agree to enter into mediation and agree on an impartial mediator selected from a list of qualified and trained mediators maintained by the Department. If mediation is successful, then a written agreement is developed and signed by the parent and a Department representative. All discussions during mediations are confidential and may not be used in any subsequent due process hearings or civil proceedings. Mediation must be completed within 30 days of the decision to mediate. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to mediation cases and track timelines for mediation requests.

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

System Point of Entry Contract

The State of Missouri contracts with a single System Point of Entry (SPOE) to operate the Part C program in each of the ten regions of the State. The SPOE contract is on a five year cycle. The current contract began July 1, 2014 and ends June 30, 2019. Each agency awarded the contract employs certain staff, including a SPOE Director and a sufficient number of Service Coordinators and support staff to administer the program within the designated region.

On an annual basis, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section review specific SPOE contract standards for child find, compliance, early intervention teams, IFSP meeting activities and a needs assessment plan. If a SPOE does not meet at least the minimum performance for each standard, liquidated damages are applied and a technical assistance plan is created to assist the SPOE with operations in the region.

The current SPOE contract contains requirements for working with families participating in Part C, including: (A) compliance standards; (B) best practices; and, (C) needs assessment.

A. Compliance Standards: Per contract requirements, each SPOE must comply with federal and State regulations for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and other laws or regulations related to the State's Part C program. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators, with help from the Area Directors. The Department conducts annual compliance monitoring to ensure SPOEs are implementing the regional program according to federal and State regulations.

B. Best Practices: Per contract requirements, each SPOE implements early intervention teams of providers to conduct evaluation and assessment activities and deliver early intervention services to families of children with disabilities. Missouri's team model was established using best practices for serving children in natural environments according to nationally recognized recommended practices. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to providers delivering services in the designated region, with help from the Area Directors.

C. Needs Assessment: Per contract requirements, each SPOE agency completes an annual needs assessment. The purpose of the needs assessment is to use data to identify the strengths and challenges in the regional system and identify areas that need training or technical assistance for Service Coordinators and providers in the region. The needs assessment includes observations of intake visits, IFSP meetings and provider practices in home visits. Each SPOE Director is responsible for using multiple data sources to inform any adjustments to the regional plan.

Statewide and Regional Technical Assistance

Staff in the Department's Early Intervention section provide technical assistance in two ways: (A) statewide technical assistance; and, (B) regional technical assistance.

A. Statewide Technical Assistance: Staff provide guidance and instructions to SPOEs and providers on various topics related to Part C requirements, including: timely services; parental consent; the 45-day timeline; and transition from Part C to Part B. General Part C information is available statewide through the Department's website, including written documents such as a practice manual and webinars. In June of each year, staff provide face-to-face training for SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators to reiterate requirements and best practices in service delivery.

Additionally, information related to evidence-based practices in early intervention is provided to SPOEs and providers, including: natural environments; home visiting practices; child outcomes, and effective transitions. Guidance documents on evidence-based practices are available on the Department's website. On an annual basis, Area Directors provide training to SPOEs and providers to reinforce best practices for serving children with disabilities.

B. Regional Technical Assistance: In addition to statewide technical assistance, targeted technical assistance may be provided to a region based on a collection and review of different types of data in Missouri's Part C program. The need for regional technical assistance may be determined from a review of quantitative data (e.g., data posted monthly on the Department's website, canned reports available in the WebSPOE) or qualitative data (e.g., surveys of provider or Service Coordinator needs for additional information, training or meeting post-assessments, concerns about the quality of provider practices).

Targeted technical assistance is not intended to be a statewide activity, rather assistance to a specific region based on an identified need. However, if multiple regions are having the same issue, targeted technical assistance may become a statewide activity.

Through placing high emphasis on scheduled, statewide technical assistance, regular data reviews, targeted technical assistance and problem solving, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section provide a comprehensive technical assistance system for Missouri's Part C program.

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Online Training Modules

The Department has online training available to provide basic information about the Part C program. There are six modules in the training series that provide an orientation to the Part C program and address the process of assessment, identification of appropriate levels of service, family engagement and delivery of services in the natural environment. The online training modules are reviewed and updated on an annual basis to ensure the content is consistent with all federal and State regulations or State laws governing the Missouri Part C program.

Each module includes content, video, resources and an assessment to measure competency related to the topic addressed in the module. The modules are provided at no-cost to the general public; however, individuals enrolling in the Missouri Part C program as an early intervention provider or Service Coordinator must successfully complete assessments.

Individuals enrolling as an early intervention provider are required to complete the first module, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to enrollment. Providers have six months from initial enrollment to complete the second, third and fourth modules. Modules five and six are optional for providers.

However, individuals enrolling as Service Coordinators are required to complete all six online training modules, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to accepting a caseload and conducting activities as a Service Coordinator.

Early Intervention Teams

The Missouri Part C program uses a transdisciplinary team approach to service delivery called an early intervention team (EIT). Teams are designated by the System Point of Entry (SPOE) to serve a specified area within the SPOE region. Each EIT must include at least one Service Coordinator, Physical Therapist, Occupational Therapist, Speech/Language Pathologist and Special Instructor. The number of teams per region is determined by the SPOE.

The EIT serves as the main source of providers for families in the Part C program. IFSP services are provided using a primary service provider approach where one professional from the team, or primary provider, is chosen by the IFSP team to serve as the main support to the family. Families requiring services from disciplines other than those represented on the EIT (i.e., ancillary providers) will receive those services from other disciplines enrolled with the Central Finance Office.

Throughout 2006 - 2008, Missouri explored various service delivery models and held numerous stakeholder meetings to solicit input from providers, Service Coordinators and parents. In 2009, Missouri began moving to a transdisciplinary team model with the award of SPOE contracts, which included a requirement to assign new families referred to the Part C program to an

EIT. The SPOE contract listed four benchmarks for implementing teams as a way to scale-up the SPOE's capacity to manage teams. The final benchmark was 100% of new families assigned in 2012-13 and was successfully met in all regions.

Missouri's team model was established using the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like" document developed by the workgroup on principles and practices in natural environments, an OSEP TA community of practice for Part C settings. This document outlines the key principles and concepts for delivering services in natural settings as well as examples illustrating what the practice should "look like."

With the assistance of the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC) and Dr. Robin McWilliam, Missouri Part C staff developed five levels of training for Service Coordinators and providers who participate on teams. All five levels of training were disseminated using a face-to-face training format in 2009-10 through 2013-14. In addition to regular training, providers and Service Coordinators receive written information and technical assistance, as needed.

The content of the five training levels include an orientation to EIT practices, the distinction between EI and IFSP teams, how to conduct a routines-based interview and how to deliver support-based home visits. The State used various pieces of literature to develop the trainings, including the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like" document, peer-reviewed journal articles about evidence-based practices for assessing young children with disabilities and delivering effective home visits.

Benchmarks for Program Improvement

Staff in the Department's Early Intervention section recently developed a set of key measurements, or benchmarks, to continuously measure program improvement in Missouri Part C. The benchmarks were created through a compilation of various resources but the primary influence was the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like" document. Six benchmarks were selected as key processes in early intervention, including referral, assessment, services, exiting the program and support to professionals. Within each benchmark there are essential functions identified by staff in the Early Intervention section as indicators for implementation, measurement and evaluation of program improvement.

Beginning in State fiscal year 2016, at the end of each fiscal year, staff in the Early Intervention section will analyze data from the previous fiscal year to compile regional results for each benchmark. As a result of the compilation, each benchmark will have a performance rating of emerging, satisfactory or best practice for each SPOE region. The regional benchmarks will be analyzed to determine the area of greatest need and subsequent training or targeted technical assistance will be provided to the region in the following fiscal year. In turn, the regional data will be compiled into one statewide rating for the program that is analyzed for overall progress towards statewide program improvement.

Through placing high emphasis on multiple methods to deliver evidence-based practices for young children with disabilities to providers and Service Coordinators, along with benchmarks for measuring regional performance to make data-driven decisions for training and technical assistance needs, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section provide a comprehensive professional development system for Missouri's Part C program.

Attachments

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Stakeholder Involvement:  apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from Department staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

When preparing the SPP/APR, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section send a draft SPP/APR document to Part B/619 staff in the Department for review and input prior to dissemination outside of the Department.

At the end of each calendar year, the Department sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which include parents of

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

children with disabilities, early intervention providers and State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2012 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2012 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2012 APR in 2014, is available.

The Department reports annually to the public on the performance of the State and each SPOE compared to the targets established in the SPP/APR. The public report for each SPOE is compiled at the same time the SPP/APR is being prepared, and is posted within 120 days of the submission of the SPP/APR. The public report for each SPOE is posted on the Department's website on the SPP/APR page at: <http://dese.mo.gov/special-education/state-performance-plan>.

Once OSEP has completed its review of the Part C SPP/APR, the full document and related requirements will be available to the public at the following website: <https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/8254>.

Attachments

| File Name | Uploaded By | Uploaded Date |
|---------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| No APR attachments found. | | |

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments



Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 69.00% | 81.50% | 89.90% | 90.40% | 87.50% | 91.50% | 81.60% | 87.10% | 95.51% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 85 | 109 | 95.51% | 100% | 97.25% |

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner)

21

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least two updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point Of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Data | | 96.90% | 97.40% | 97.90% | 98.00% | 98.20% | 98.90% | 98.90% | 99.00% | 99.34% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target ≥ | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 97.00% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

When preparing this SPP/APR, staff in the Department's Early Intervention section sent a draft SPP/APR document to Part B/619 staff in the Department for review and input prior to dissemination outside of the Department.

In December, the Department sent a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which include parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers and State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held in January.

These groups were asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--|----------|---|-------|----------------|
| SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/2/2015 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 5,355 | |
| SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/2/2015 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 5,388 | |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers with | Total number of infants and | FFY 2013 | FFY 2014 | FFY 2014 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

| IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | toddlers with IFSPs | Data* | Target* | Data |
|---|---------------------|--------|---------|--------|
| 5,355 | 5,388 | 99.34% | 95.00% | 99.39% |

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

Historical Data

| | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----|---------------|----------|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1 | 2009 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 68.40% | 69.20% | 69.20% | 69.20% | 69.20% |
| | | Data | | | | | 76.00% | 69.10% | 61.70% | 74.60% | 79.10% | 79.89% |
| A2 | 2009 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 53.50% | 47.50% | 47.50% | 47.50% | 20.00% |
| | | Data | | | | | 59.40% | 47.40% | 41.00% | 43.50% | 38.40% | 31.76% |
| B1 | 2009 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 67.30% | 70.40% | 70.40% | 70.40% | 70.40% |
| | | Data | | | | | 74.80% | 70.30% | 63.80% | 76.90% | 80.40% | 81.70% |
| B2 | 2009 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 51.40% | 45.60% | 45.60% | 45.60% | 20.00% |
| | | Data | | | | | 57.10% | 45.50% | 41.80% | 41.30% | 38.50% | 33.67% |
| C1 | 2009 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 72.00% | 73.10% | 73.10% | 73.10% | 73.10% |
| | | Data | | | | | 80.00% | 73.00% | 65.90% | 78.20% | 81.80% | 82.48% |
| C2 | 2009 | Target ≥ | | | | | | 41.70% | 36.20% | 36.20% | 36.20% | 15.00% |
| | | Data | | | | | 46.30% | 36.10% | 32.50% | 33.20% | 31.10% | 25.82% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A1 ≥ | 69.20% | 69.20% | 69.20% | 69.20% | 69.20% |
| Target A2 ≥ | 20.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 47.50% |
| Target B1 ≥ | 70.40% | 70.40% | 70.40% | 70.40% | 70.40% |
| Target B2 ≥ | 20.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 45.60% |
| Target C1 ≥ | 73.10% | 73.10% | 73.10% | 73.10% | 73.10% |
| Target C2 ≥ | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 15.00% | 36.20% |

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Re-entered target data due to prepopulation error.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the description of stakeholder input described in indicator 2.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|--|---------|
| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed | 3073.00 |
|--|---------|

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 52.00 | 1.69% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 431.00 | 14.03% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1766.00 | 57.47% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 535.00 | 17.41% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 289.00 | 9.40% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$. | 2301.00 | 2784.00 | 79.89% | 69.20% | 82.65% |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$. | 824.00 | 3073.00 | 31.76% | 20.00% | 26.81% |

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 61.00 | 1.99% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 389.00 | 12.66% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1967.00 | 64.01% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 509.00 | 16.56% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 147.00 | 4.78% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$. | 2476.00 | 2926.00 | 81.70% | 70.40% | 84.62% |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$. | 656.00 | 3073.00 | 33.67% | 20.00% | 21.35% |

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

| | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 55.00 | 1.79% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 393.00 | 12.79% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 1803.00 | 58.67% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 621.00 | 20.21% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 201.00 | 6.54% |

| | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$. | 2424.00 | 2872.00 | 82.48% | 73.10% | 84.40% |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$. | 822.00 | 3073.00 | 25.82% | 15.00% | 26.75% |

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Definition of “comparable to same-aged peers”

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by Part C personnel, “comparable to same-aged peers” is defined as a rating of “5” on a scale of 1-5, meaning “completely (all of the time/typical)” in response to the question “To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?” A rating of “5” roughly translates to a 0-10% delay.

Instruments for Collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)

Part C personnel determine the appropriate tools to collect assessment results for this indicator as personnel are not required to use a specific assessment instrument. However, Part C personnel must use three sources of information in order to collect ECO data. The three sources of information are parent input, professional observation and assessment results. In order to synthesize the three sources of information into a comprehensive summary, the State provides the Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) form, which is designed specifically to address information relevant to Indicator 3 on the Part C SPP/APR.

After reviewing the use of the three sources of information for collecting ECO data, the State decided to begin a Part C pilot project in 2012-13 to embed the ECO collection in IFSP meeting activities. In 2014-15 three of the ten regions participated in the pilot and exit data from these regions were included in Indicator 3.

Procedures for Reporting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)

Each eligible child entering the Part C program must have an ECO rating if the child has the potential of being in the program at least six months. A rating between 1-5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning “Not Yet” and 5 meaning “Completely.”

Entry and exit data are recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively. All Part C entry and exit data are entered into the electronic child record system, WebSPOE.

The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings. The State analyzes the data at the

end of each fiscal year.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

| | Baseline Year | FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|---|---------------|----------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2006 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | Data | | 93.50% | 92.30% | 92.70% | 94.60% | 96.10% | 96.80% | 96.20% | 96.90% | 96.21% |
| B | 2006 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | Data | | 95.60% | 95.60% | 95.90% | 95.60% | 97.60% | 97.20% | 97.20% | 97.79% | 97.86% |
| C | 2006 | Target ≥ | | | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| | | Data | | 98.20% | 96.30% | 96.60% | 97.40% | 98.50% | 97.70% | 98.00% | 98.62% | 98.23% |

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A ≥ | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% |
| Target B ≥ | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.70% |
| Target C ≥ | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 96.40% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the description of stakeholder input described in indicator 2.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|---|--------|
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 810.00 |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 796.00 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 807.00 |
| B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 774.00 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 805.00 |
| C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 785.00 |

C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn

804.00

| | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 96.21% | 95.00% | 98.64% |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 97.86% | 95.00% | 96.15% |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 98.23% | 95.00% | 97.64% |

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Survey Methodology: In 2014-15, an updated instrument was used to collect family outcomes for this indicator. Changes to the instrument were initiated by stakeholder input; primarily members of the State Interagency Coordination Council (SICC), the SICC parent committee and staff in Missouri Parents Act (MPACT), which is Missouri's parent training and information center.

An analysis of the survey content by MPACT staff is what initially prompted a discussion about changing the survey to families. Two years in a row, the analyses suggested questions were confusing and parent responses were conflicting, all of which indicated the survey was not gathering the information the state needed for family outcomes. The rationale for revising the survey was to create a more concise, meaningful survey for families.

State staff reviewed each of the 31 questions in the previous survey and considered the purpose of the question and how the responses are used to improve the program. State staff identified two sets of questions were necessary for the new survey: (1) questions related to this indicator and (2) questions for program improvement. For questions related to this indicator, state staff retained the integrity of original survey items in order to maintain trend data from year to year. For questions related to program improvement, state staff retained some questions specific to Missouri's program and aligned other questions needed for program improvement with two national surveys, National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and Family Outcome Survey-Revised (FOS-R).

State staff revised the previous survey and shared a draft with the SICC and parent committee members for further analysis and discussion. The result of the analyses was a 16 question family survey containing five questions specifically for the APR, four questions that align with national surveys, and seven questions unique to Missouri's program.

The revisions to questions related to this indicator were not significant enough to warrant changing the baseline for Indicator 4. The updated survey instrument used to collect data for this indicator can be found at: <http://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files/2015%20Family%20Survey.pdf>

Using a census methodology, surveys were mailed to all parents with a child in active IFSP status. If a family had more than one child in the Part C program, the parents received more than one survey. In 2014-15, parents were given the option to submit responses online or via mail.

The response rate for 2014-15 was 14.5%, which is a decrease from the previous rate of 21.5%. An analysis of responses by SPOE region indicates the response rates for 2014-15 are similar to regional response rates from the prior year.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? Yes



Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State



No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Submitted collection tool: [2015 Family Survey](#)

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | | | 0.73% | 0.76% | 0.79% | 0.82% | 0.85% | 0.85% | 0.85% | 0.80% |
| Data | | 0.71% | 0.64% | 0.76% | 0.75% | 0.84% | 0.92% | 0.97% | 0.98% | 1.01% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | 0.80% | 0.80% | 0.80% | 0.80% | 0.80% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the description of stakeholder input described in indicator 2.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--|----------|--|--------|----------------|
| SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/2/2015 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 846 | null |
| U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013 | 4/3/2014 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 74,184 | null |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 846 | 74,184 | 1.01% | 0.80% | 1.14% |

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find***Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data*Baseline Data: 2005*

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | | | 1.57% | 1.59% | 1.61% | 1.64% | 1.67% | 1.67% | 1.67% | 2.00% |
| Data | | 1.48% | 1.37% | 1.45% | 1.55% | 1.72% | 1.96% | 2.21% | 2.23% | 2.22% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update**FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets**

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target ≥ | 2.00% | 2.00% | 2.00% | 2.00% | 2.00% |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see the description of stakeholder input described in indicator 2.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|--|----------|--|---------|----------------|
| SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups | 7/2/2015 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 5,388 | |
| U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013 | 7/2/2015 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 223,433 | |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 5,388 | 223,433 | 2.22% | 2.00% | 2.41% |

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find



Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 90.90% | 95.10% | 95.30% | 95.00% | 100% | 96.00% | 100% | 94.00% | 100% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline | Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 40 | 51 | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline)

11

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|------|------|------|------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 60.10% | 92.70% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 98.40% | 48.00% | 89.47% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.



Yes



No

| Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|---|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 70 | 79 | 89.47% | 100% | 89.87% |

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services)

1

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least two updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point Of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE developed a transition plan with steps and services, although late, for any child whose transition plan was delayed, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the Part C program.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|--------|--------|------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 64.00% | 90.90% | 94.70% | 98.60% | 100% | 100% | 95.10% | 84.80% | 100% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA



Yes



No

| Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 78 | 79 | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Number of parents who opted out (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)

1

Describe the method used to collect these data

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring

Procedures.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? Yes

Is the policy on file with the Department? Yes

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|--------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|--------|------|
| Target | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | | 57.00% | 78.10% | 94.20% | 92.60% | 91.20% | 100% | 100% | 92.90% | 100% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services



Yes



No

| Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B | Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|--|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 77 | 79 | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference (this number will be subtracted from the number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B when calculating the FFY 2014 Data)

1

FFY 2014 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances (this number will be added to the Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)

1

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?



State monitoring



State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

See the General Supervision System section in the Introduction for more information on the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Data | | | | | | | | | | |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ | | | | | |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri Part C did not adopt Part B due process procedures. This indicator is not applicable per instructions in the Part C SPP/APR Measurement Table.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|-----------|--|------|----------------|
| SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/5/2015 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | null | null |
| SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/5/2015 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | null | null |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| null | null | | | |

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

| FFY | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ | | | | | | | | | | |
| Data | | | | | | | | | | |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Target ≥ | | | | | |

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Missouri Part C did not establish baseline or targets due to having no mediation data. If in a future reporting period the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, Missouri Part C will develop baseline and targets.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data | Overwrite Data |
|---|-----------|---|------|----------------|
| SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/5/2015 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | n | null |
| SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/5/2015 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | n | null |
| SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/5/2015 | 2.1 Mediations held | n | null |

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

| 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 2.1 Mediations held | FFY 2013 Data* | FFY 2014 Target* | FFY 2014 Data |
|---|---|---------------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan



Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

| FFY | 2013 | 2014 |
|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | | 71.10% |
| Data | 69.10% | 92.00% |

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

| FFY | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 73.10% | 75.10% | 77.10% | 79.10% |

Key:

Description of Measure

No changes were made to Phase I. Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No changes were made to Phase I. Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

Overview

No changes were made to Phase I. Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

No changes were made to Phase I. Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

No changes were made to Phase I. Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

No changes were made to Phase I. Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

Description

No changes were made to Phase I. Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

No changes were made to Phase I. Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

No changes were made to Phase I. Missouri's Phase I submission can be located in the State Profile.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

This information is included in the Phase II document, which is under Attachments.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

This information is included in the Phase II document, which is under Attachments.

Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

This information is included in the Phase II document, which is under Attachments.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

This information is included in the Phase II document, which is under Attachments.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.